CONSER contributions of authenticated serial records to the DLF Registry of Digital Masters (RDM)

Problem: Participants at the CONSER operations meeting in May 2007 will be examining their current use of the single record approach in general, potential CONSER contributions to the RDM, and their willingness to expand the elements used for the single record approach in accommodating contributions to the RDM.

Discussion: RDM records are a subset of OCLC and are identified by the authentication code "dlr." The service registers the intent to preserve and maintain accessibility of digitally reformatted and born digital monograph and serial resources. It provides information about whether or not a resource has been digitized, the adequacy of preservation and facilitates harvesting and reuse of data. In order to meet the goals and functionality of the registry, data specific to the digitization are needed in the record. The required elements include several more than are currently outlined for the CONSER single record approach in CCM 31.2.3. Required elements for the RDM according to the forthcoming version of DLF *Record Creation Guidelines* are listed in Appendix A of this document. Groups vetting guidelines for contributing to the RDM (PARS, CIC, CONSER) have recently discussed the need to include series tracings for series that appear as part of a digital version, but not on print version issues, in the single record approach for contributions to the RDM.

Factors to consider:

The RDM and CONSER / PCC presence

- The RDM has the potential to be a valuable resource and institutions that are leaders in digitization activities are contributing to its development, including some institutions that are also CONSER. Currently there are very few records for serials in the RDM (35 as of April 2) and even fewer CONSER records (3 as of April 2). While for the near term few CONSER libraries have plans in place to contribute, several CONSER libraries have indicated that it is likely their institution will be interested sometime in the future.

- Contributors to RDM include a wide set of OCLC members authorized to add the authentication code "dlr" for serial and monographic resources. This set of users is wider than the membership of CONSER and the PCC. Non-CONSER institutions are likely to continue developing codes needed to work with the single record approach in the RDM, whether or not CONSER decides to contribute single record approach records to the RDM.

The Single Record Approach: Pros and Cons

Pros

- The recent survey on use of the single record approach for e-serials in general (for non RDM titles) indicate that many CONSER libraries use it either exclusively or in a mixed approach along with separate records.

- Provisions for using a single record approach for both monographs and serials have been in the RDM guidelines since the beginning of the registry. It's a practice many institutions are familiar with. It has been a common local approach for many years, guidelines for working with national level CONSER records were developed in the mid-1990s, OCLC provides for its use in WorldCat http://www.oclc.org/support/documentation/worldcat/cataloging/electronicresources/default.htm#11.

- The single record approach provides a quick means of contributing records to the digital registry without the need to create a national level record for the e-version if one does not already exist.

- Proposed coding for RDM fields allows unwanted fields to be removed upon local downloading. Proposed coding could also be used for series associated with the digital version added to the print record.

Cons

- CONSER file subscribers use the CONSER file to populate and update many serials related tools. These subscribers include ILS companies, the ISSN Network, and companies that develop electronic resource management systems. Over the years subscribers have had questions about the single record approach in general and in particular the appropriateness of the optional 007 for the electronic on the print record.

- Some of the comments at ALA midwinter meetings pointed out that mixing of holdings for the electronic and print without a clear distinction of what is held might interfere with ILL.

- Comments have pointed out that adding too much data to the print record, data that's not pertinent to the item in hand, may be confusing and so requires local processing to remove the data.

- Several institutions have mentioned the need to reconsider the single record approach at least locally for several reasons including the availability of separate e-version records from MARC record services.

Proposal for CONSER

CONSER could ask its membership, for the next year to follow the *preference* stated in the current version of the DLF guidelines (italics below are mine):

"One bibliographic record could represent all versions of an item, but it is *preferred* that a separate record be supplied for each manifestation when physical formats and system requirements differ from the original form of an item/object."

That is for the next year, CONSER members would be asked to contribute only authenticated aggregator-neutral separate records to the RDM. Members could continue to use the single record approach according to the guidelines in CCM 31.2.3 for other e-serials.

This would allow CONSER time to gather data on the potential impact on subscribers of the CONSER file of additional elements required for RDM on the print record.

It would allow time for CONSER members to reevaluate their need for single record approach contributions to the RDM as more institutions develop plans to contribute records.

Since non-CONSER institutions are likely to continue developing coding needed to work with the single record approach in the RDM, CONSER could evaluate the usefulness of these elements and reconsider the environment in a year.

The time could also be used for experimentation. The "Workflows" appendix in the forthcoming *Record Creation Guidelines* includes a "Possible workflow for institutions that use single records for both original and digital: create special records for contribution that reflect only the digitized." It suggests the use of a MARCEdit script for creating a separate record for the digital to contribute to the RDM. There is however an important maintenance issue raised in these instructions, see Appendix B.

The *Record Creation Guidelines* contains a road map for future developments. One future development is further exploration of using the MARC 21 Format for Holdings data to record precise holdings. This is a development CONSER members should monitor.

Appendix A Required elements for RDM records:

007 (byte 00 of c for electronic resource and byte 13 of a for access copy or p for preservation copy)
042 dlr (in addition to any other authentication code)
506 for access restriction. This is important because the digital registry may contain records for materials that are not available to the public. This field can be used by harvesters that only want records for freely available resources, for example.
533 which gives information on the place of reproduction, agency responsible for the reproduction, date of reproduction, volumes reproduced, and notes about the reproduction.
538 which gives the specifications that were used for digitization.
583 which gives preservation information, such as committed to preserve.
856 which gives the URL for the resource (when available)

Appendix B Excerpt for updated 2007 *Record Creation Guidelines:*

Possible workflow for institutions that use single records for both original and digital: create special records for contribution that reflect only the digitized.

Environment: Some institutions may have a single record that covers both the original and the digitized with an 856 link for the digitized version. If an institution does not want to add the required fields to reflect the digital on the same record, it could follow this alternative approach. Portions of the record are extracted and fields added that are required by the registry so that the record for the registry reflects the digitized version only.

In contributing to the Registry, the record must be loaded into WorldCat, since that is the way that OCLC pulls these records. Thus, WorldCat will contain two records: the original record that covers both the analog and the digital and this "massaged" record created solely for contribution to the Registry.

Workflow:
1. Identify records in the local catalog for a category of material.

2. Export these as MARC.

3. Use a script in MARCEdit (already developed) to add/change/delete fields as noted below (MARCEdit is available free and must be on the computer used to be able to apply the script. The script may be supplied upon request).

Fields:
001. Change the control number if needed so that it isn't identical to that of the original record.

003. Add 003 to identify whose control number it is.

005. Update to current date

007/11 (Antecedent/source): (if desirable and known) add a value depending on what the item was digitized from

007/13 = p (preservation)

008/23 = s (electronic)

042 = dlr (may add $a to an existing 042 in some cases)

245 Add $h [electronic resource] to follow $a np (usually just $a will be present)

506 = $f[appropriate access statement] $2star

533 = $aElectronic reproduction. $b [place] : $c [institution]

538 = $aMaster and use copy. $u[URL for description of digitization process if available]

583 = $adigitized $c[date if available] $h[institution name] $lcommitted to preserve $2pda $5[institution MARC organization code]

776 = $coriginal $w[control number of original]

856 = $3 $u (as appropriate); change 2nd indicator from 1 to 0.

4. Strip the following: local variable fields, 035s from original record; existing 530s, existing 007s (would either be an electronic resource 007 that isn't as rich as the one we would provide for the registry, or for the original manifestation).

5. Maintenance issue: There is the question of maintenance if the record for the original gets modified. The institution may need to keep track of what it has sent in this manner. That would involve working out a procedure for also updating the extracted record for the digitized item in these cases.